DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 496 EC 103 560

TITLE	Project Team: Teacher Encouragement to Activate Mainstreaming. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Fullerton Union High School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
GRANT	76-6-A
NOTE	45p.; For additional information see EC 103 558 and EC 103 559 ; Parts may reproduce poorly due to ink and paper colors
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educable Mentally Handicapped; Exceptional Child Research; *Learning Disabilities; Mentally Handicapped; *Program Descriptions; *Regular Class Placement; Resource Teachers; Secondary Education; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Presented is the final report of Project TEAM (Teacher Encouragement to Activate Mainstreaming) to improve the attitudes and skills of seven regular secondary teachers serving 27 educable mentally or educationally handicapped students. Methodology is explained to have involved analysis of student records to identify students ready for mainstreaming followed by diagnostic and prescriptive data given to regular teachers, special preservice programs for the regular teachers, and intensive follow-up by the resource teacher. It is concluded that the project resulted in significant changes in teacher attitudes. Appended is a survey of teacher instructional practices related to mainstreaming. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149496

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHER ENCOURAGEMENT TO ACTIVATE MAINSTREAMING

Elizabeth Anne Trotter
Project Director

Prepared Under Grant No. 76-6-A Between the
California State Department of Education and
the Fullerton Union High School District

Division of Special Education
La Habra High School
July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977

EC103560

Foreword:

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education in the Division of Special Education, La Habra High School, La Habra, California.

The study was carried out during the academic year July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977 under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Grant No. 76-6-A between the State Department of Education and Fullerton Union High School District.

Disclaimer:

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant, and to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or La Habra High School, Fullerton Union High School District is not implied.

Elizabeth Anne Trotter
Principal Investigator

SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH PROGRAM
1976 - 1977

Project No.	Applicant	Address/Phone
76-6-A	Mr. Charles A. Boyd Fullerton Union High School District	2600 East Nutwood Avenue Fullerton, California 92631 (714) 879-4451
	(Mrs. Elizabeth A. Trotter, La Habra High School)	801 West Highlander Avenue La Habra, California 90631 (213) 697-6777

A B S T R A C T

PURPOSE OF STUDY: To improve regular teachers attitude toward mainstreaming concept and to develop or improve the skills they need to work successfully with handicapped students in the mainstream by means of a series of inservices designed to give the regular teacher the background and resources necessary for working with exceptional pupils; and therefore, initiate and facilitate successful mainstreaming.

RATIONALE: Implementation of mainstreaming programs has not taken place on a widespread or continuing basis apparently due to the failure on the part of the teachers. These teachers have no expertise in mainstreaming procedures and no background in application of enabling behaviors. These limitations cause feelings of insecurity in staff which, in turn, cause the negative attitudes.

RESEARCH DESIGN: Pre-posttest comparison group design contrasting regular and project teacher attitude toward mainstreaming; analyzed via a t test for uncorrelated means. Pre-posttest single group design on teacher skills and strategies for mainstreaming contrasting teacher self-report and principal investigator ratings based on descriptive data. Comparison of student attendance over baseline and pre-posttest examination of student academic gains in reading and math. Pre-posttest comparison group design contrasting project students with regular students' attitude toward school analyzed via a t test for uncorrelated means.

TARGETED POPULATION: Seven professional staff members (5 male, 2 female) served 27 special education students in grades 9-12 included 8 identified as Educable Mentally Retarded and 19 identified as Educationally Handicapped. Seventy-four percent of the students in the study were males.

HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED: Analysis of student records to identify students who demonstrated readiness for mainstreaming was followed by diagnostic and prescriptive data given to regular teachers. A series of special preservices for regular teachers was conducted; these teachers also were involved in staffing of special education students who were in their classes. Close follow-up provided by the resource teacher included materials and inservices for regular teachers throughout the year, and reinforcement of teacher skills necessary for successful mainstreaming.

HOW THE RESULTS MAY BE USED: The activities and findings were used to develop a handbook, materials kit, slide tape overview, and evaluation reports including models for inservice training of classroom teachers in the mainstreaming process; resource guides and materials for dissemination to regular class teachers; and provision of data to encourage increased use of the model to stimulate and facilitate successful implementation of mainstreaming education agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Historical Overview and Literature Review	1
Methods	8
Statistical Approach/Analysis	10
Data Presentation and Results	12
Evaluators Comments	22
Summary/Conclusions/Recommendations	24
Appendix A - Teacher Mainstreaming Skills and Strategies Survey	26
Appendix B - Teacher Survey	28
Appendix C - Staff Development Record	32

LIST OF TABLES AND/OR ILLUSTRATIONS

		Page
Table 1:	Summary of Staff Self-Appraisal and Project Director Appraisal of Staff Skills and Strategies Relative to Needs of Mainstreamed Students	12
Table 2:	Summary of Project and Comparison Group Teacher Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Concept	14
Table 3:	1976-77 Pre and Posttest - WRAT Data	16
Table 4:	Summary of SSI Posttest Differences Between Project and Comparison Group Students	18
Table 5:	Summary of Pre and Posttest SSI Data Taken on Project Participants and Comparison Group Students	19

Historical Overview and Literature Review

Mainstreaming as a new educational practice emerged from many motives.

First is the rejection of labeling children. It is widely believed that if a child is called slow, retarded, handicapped or disturbed, the lable will stick and influence the way the child is treated by the people around him. It will also influence, in a negative fashion, the way the child perceives himself.

A second source of motivation for mainstreaming grows from the technical and scientific progress of instructional materials. They are becoming more compact and more mobil. Instructional materials are standardized and mass produced. At the same time, special teaching methods that formerly depended on the creative artistry of the gifted teacher have now been systematized, packaged, and distributed. Improved production and distribution of teaching methods have widened the area of application to both the regular and the exceptional pupil permitting them to learn together, side by side.

The third source of pressure for change rises out of court actions which have ordered change.

The United States Constitution does not mention education. The 10th Amendment, part of the Bill of Rights added to the Constitution in 1791, placed education under the responsibility and the authority of the states.

In 1974, litigation was initiated in at least 20 states where parents of special education students were bringing suit for denial to their handicapped children of "equal protection" under the 14th Amendment. Many of their handicapped children, they claimed, were excluded from schools on the grounds that there was no provision for them. As a result, handicapped children have been held by the legislature and courts of some states, and the federal structure, to be entitled to be equal participants in, and the equal beneficiaries of the above educational goals. This effort of equal opportunity has been growing.

Finally, there is the factor of rising costs. While little is known of the comparative costs, recent studies have found the expense of transportation contributing in a major way to the high per pupil cost of special education. What information there is, however, suggests that mainstreaming is no more expensive than presently existing special education programs. Thus, mainstreaming may prove to be a style of educational management which produces better schooling for all children along with more efficient utilization of the schools resources.

What is "mainstreaming"? The concept has been interpreted in a number of ways. The extreme interpretations extend from the integration of special classes into a school by providing classrooms for them in the same building as those for non-handicapped children to abolishing all special classes and absorbing handicapped pupils in the school into classes on an age-grade basis. Between these extremes are endeavors to place handicapped children into the same programs as non-handicapped students, but with

assistance provided by resource teachers and other specialists to help maintain progress and to prevent failure.

J. W. Birch (1974) defines mainstreaming as "a carefully designed, balanced and individualized quid pro quo teaching arrangement beneficial to children with a variety of kinds of school problems."

H. J. Prehm (1974) sees mainstreaming as referring primarily to "assigning handicapped children to the regular grades to receive their education." He sees mainstreamed handicapped children as those "who receive both regular and special services to the regular grades." He considers that the degree of mainstreaming in respect of a child will depend upon the severity of the child's handicap and the amount of time spent in the regular classroom, which, in turn, will depend upon the nature of the specialist resource facilities available. Prehm's definition of a handicapped child is significant in this context:

> A handicapped child is one whose skill levels are below the skill levels of his cultural and/or ethnic group age peers.

The emphasis in the definition is on the level of performance of the child in skills of the type that are basic to school curricula. There is no delineation of the category in which the child should be placed in terms of his handicap. The definition reflects the attitude that the attainment level of a child is a function of both his biological handicap and the extent to which he has been taught. A mildly handicapped child is one who has exhibited small, but significant, deviations in one or more skill areas or an extreme deviation in only one skill area. A severely

handicapped child is one who exhibits deviation from his cultural/age peers in three or more skill areas. Prehm considers that handicapped children who will enter the mainstream will come from the mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled categories.

The Implementation of Mainstreaming

Proposals for implementing mainstreaming programs have been presented by an increasing number of authors. The following underlying assumptions have been expressed by Prehm:

(a) Special education is a basic element of the school program and not a supplementary part of it.

(b) Mainstreaming can occur at any level of schooling, from preschool to secondary.

(c) Mainstreaming is not for everybody -- it is not for every school, not every teacher, not every child.

(d) Mainstreaming is an integral part of a more comprehensive system for delivering services to exceptional or handicapped children.

Some very practical and logical comments about mainstreaming, all of which are supportive of Prehm's contentions, have been made by R. Reger. Reger (1974) points out that if mainstreaming is considered to be simply a return to the normal classroom without basic changes in the programming, the children will be "put back into the very failure situations which led to their specialized placements."

Reger lists a number of principles that he considers to be involved in mainstreaming. They include:

(a) No child should be categorized with a lable reflecting a gross diagnostic category.

(b) Children should be evaluated with relevant instruments to determine those areas of strength and weakness that relate directly to specific, objective instructional actions.

(c) Groupings of all children in the school should be based on defined needs. For children with special needs, as many additional support services as possible should be provided, both directly to the children and to their teachers.

(d) Diagnostic and prescriptive services for children with special needs are not enough. Such services should be tied directly to implementation services, and, whenever possible, the same personnel who provide diagnostic and prescriptive services should also implement the instructional program, in cooperation with other teachers.

(e) Consultation services to teaching personnel should have direct application to the instructional program, providing materials to use, techniques to try and management strategies.

(f) Some children with severe disabilities will have to be grouped together for at least part of their day, if for no other reason that they cannot be placed to their advantage with non-handicapped children. Such groupings should be based on individual performance criteria. not on gross and irrelevant non-educational diagnostic categories.

(g) The leadership of the school, from the superintendent to the building principal and president of the teachers organization, should work together on total program implementation. Needs for teacher in-service training should evolve out of the perceptions and experiences of the teachers themselves, not be poured in, uninvited, from experts.

The value of various alternatives to self-contained classrooms for the exceptional child will not be known until rigorous research studies are made. Problems such as the randomization of subjects into treatment groups, sample size, and adequate control of the teacher variables, generally present major difficulties.

The most promising research study on the effectiveness of alternative special education instructional services is Project PRIME -- Programmed Reentry Into Mainstream Education (Kaufman, Semmel and Agard, 1974). The study sought answers to a number of questions:

(1) How effective is mainstreaming for mildly handicapped children, for whom is it successful and under what conditions?

(2) What are the determinants of an effective educational program for handicapped children in the public schools?

(3) What are the factors that promote children's development in the academic, social and emotional spheres?

They found that there is a need to reassess the practices that have been established in the education of handicapped children. There is not complete agreement on the principle of the integration of exceptional children into the normal stream, for questions such as "who is to be integrated?" and "How is integration to take place?" would receive a variety of answers. There appears to be increasing optimism about reintroducing special education students back into the regular school program. It is encouraging that evaluation and accountability (to the parent and child) in special education are receiving higher priority as part of the process of reassessment.

If the mainstreaming of handicapped children is to be successful, the professional quality of teachers, both regular and special, will be a major concern. Intensive in-service training of teachers would be essential to prepare them to cope with a wider range of abilities in the classroom, to identify children with learning problems at an early stage and to take appropriate

remedial action. Rarely in such classrooms should be heard the statement: "That non-reader needs a specialist."

Back-up support that provides diagnostic-prescriptive and/or behavior management assistance should be available to regular classroom teachers on request. These services should be given by competent special educators, but the responsibility for the instruction of the child would be with the classroom teacher.

Methods

Seven teachers who had been teaching regular high school classes in a suburban comprehensive high school were selected as a target group to include in their classes students with identified learning disabilities. The teachers were to have received specialized inservice training and resource teacher support to facilitate replacement of students who had been placed in special education classes back into the "mainstream" of the regular school program. The students who were involved in the project had been classified as educationally handicapped (N = 22), educably mentally retarded (N = 4), and aphasic (N = 5); a total of 31 students were involved.

The teachers were given a series of 10 inservice sessions and the support of a resource teacher who was knowledgeable about working with special education students.

Observations of the teachers' ability to work with the mainstreamed students were taken via self-report and ratings of the resource teacher on a set of characteristics which exemplified teacher behaviors requisite to "successful" mainstreaming.

The attitudes of the participating teachers toward mainstreamed students were contrasted to a randomly-selected set of their colleagues who also taught at the same high school.

Implications for student behaviors were studied by contrasting their school attendance during the project year with

their school attendance during the preceding year. Gains in academic performance, as measured by standardized norm-referenced tests were used to assess differences in academic achievement which may have been influenced by project participation. The attitude toward school of project participants were contrasted to a random sampling of students who were previously in the regular school program and who had not previously been classified as special education students.

Statistical Approach/Analysis

Analysis of teacher ability to work with the mainstreamed students was done by contrasting the percent of change between pre and post project ratings given on self-report and obtained from the project resource teacher. The percent change was compared to the level of improvement forecast in the project objective; no statistical test of significance was run on the data.

Analysis of staff attitude toward the mainstreaming concept was done by contrasting scores obtained by project teachers on a pre and posttest administration of a project-developed attitude scale. The percent of change was compared to the level of improvement forecast in the project objective. Additionally, the scores of the project staff on the attitude survey were contrasted with those of a randomly-selected group of colleagues using a t test for uncorrelated means.

Change in student attendance was analyzed by comparing the percent attendance during the project with the previous year's attendance data. The comparison was made by contrasting the percent of gain in attendance with that forecast in the objective; no statistical test of significance was run on the data.

Change in student achievement in reading and math was done by contrasting the present year's gains with those forecast from the previous year's baseline gains; no statistical test of significance was run on the data.

The difference between the attitude toward school of project participants from pre to posttest was analyzed by comparing the posttest results with the percent increase forecast in the objective over the pretest level. Also project participant attitude toward school was contrasted to a random sampling of non-project participants using a t test for uncorrelated means.

Data Presentation and Results

Objective: Teacher Outcome 1.0

An average staff competency gain of at least 20 percent in skills/strategies for meeting the needs of mainstreaming students as measured by pre-post criterion-referenced tests.

Findings:

The data taken on project teachers' ability to meet the individual needs of project students was met according to project director appraisal but not met according to staff self-report. These data are summarized in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1: Summary of Staff Self-Appraisal and Project Director Appraisal of Staff Skills and Strategies Relative to Need of Mainstreamed Students

Self-Report (N = 7)				Project Director			
Pre	Post	Gain	% Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	% Gain
34.29	40.0	5.71	16.65	33.71	57.29	23.58	69.95

Interpretation:

The staff reported becoming aware of individual differences among students to a degree they had not previously experienced, and possibly this awareness depressed their post-project self-appraisals. The project director, on the other hand, was keenly aware of staff gains and possibly had a "halo" effect operating at post-project appraisal. A more accurate indication of actual

staff change might fall somewhere between the two obtained indicators of change. In the judgment of the evaluators, the objective was attained.

Objective: Teacher Outcome 2.0

An average staff gain of 20 percent in positive attitude toward the mainstreaming concept as measured by pre-post teacher questionnaire.

Findings:

The data from the staff pre-project attitude survey indicated that they needed to attain a mean score of 63.24 on the posttest attitude survey to meet the objective. The obtained posttest mean was 58.67; the objective was not attained. The staff gained 11.33 percent in their attitude toward mainstreaming.

According to comparative data of the project staff and a random sampling of their colleagues, the project staff had a statistically significantly higher attitude score on pretest which increased to be even higher score which was less likely due to probable chance at posttest. The data illustrating these statements are presented in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2: Summary of Project and Comparison Group Teacher Attitudes Toward the Mainstreaming Concept

Pre-Test Data				
Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t
Project Staff	7	52.7	11.57	*2.95
Comparison Group	8	42.5	9.07	
Post-Test Data				
Source				
Project Staff	6	58.67	5.71	**3.71
Comparison Group	10	47.4	9.70	

* $P < .05$

** $P < .01$

Interpretation:

Both groups improved in their attitude toward the mainstreaming concept but the project staff became much more homogeneous in their attitude than did the comparison group. The establishment of a standard to be attained by the project group prior to having first-hand knowledge of the instrument to be used was apparently a planning error which should be avoided in future projects.

Objective: Student Outcome 1.0

Project participants will increase their school attendance by 50 percent as measured by attendance records.

Procedure:

The project director recorded 1975-76 attendance data for project students to use as baseline over which project partici-

pation should have a 50 percent improvement. Attendance data for the present year was maintained by the project staff. Percent of attendance was computed by determining the number of days each student actually attended school of the number of days school was in session. The total possible days attendance was divided into the number of days attended by each student. The average percent attendance was used on appropriate index of school attendance for purposes of evaluating this objective.

Findings:

The attendance of project participants this year was found to be lower than their attendance of last year. A baseline data from the 1975-76 school year indicated that mainstreamed students' level of attendance was 94.42 percent. As of April 29, 1977, project participants had achieved an 93.0 percent attendance. Since the 50 percent postulated increase of the percent objective would nessitate an impossible 141.63 percent level of attendance, the evaluator recommended that the project director resubmit an objective or maintaining the baseline level of attendance. The final data indicates that a 1.42 percent decrease in attendance was shown during the 1976-77 school year. Because the project director did not advise the evaluators that the objective had been revised as recommended, the evaluators conclude that the objective was not attained.

Objective: Student Outcome 2.0

Project students will increase academic achievement by five percent over the previous year as measured by pre to post-test gains measured by fall and spring administrations of the Wide Range Achievement Test.

Procedure:

Baseline data was obtained for students being mainstreamed during the 1975-76 school year. The gains made by those students were used to project the improved gains that students should make as a result of project impact. During the 1975-76 school year, mainstreamed students achieved a mean gain of .67 grade equivalents as shown in Table 3 below.

Each participant was administered the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) on a pre and post test schedule. The gains recorded from these test administrations provided the basis for evaluating objective attainment.

TABLE 3: 1976-77 Pre and Posttesting - WRAT Data

		Reading							
		Pretest		Posttest		Gain		Baseline	Projected 5% Mean
Source	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean Gain	Gain Score
Project Participant	18	5.37	1.76	6.05	2.36	.71	1.11	.67	.70

		Math							
		Pretest		Posttest		Gain		Baseline	Projected 5% Mean
Source	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean Gain	Gain Score
Project Participant	18	4.79	1.41	4.96	1.79	.27	1.47	No baseline data was provided	

Interpretation:

The project participants achieved a five percent gain over their previous year baseline achievement in reading. No data on math achievement was available from which to forecast a five percent gain; therefore, no comparison of math gains to anticipated gain is reported for math. The objective was attained for reading.

Objective: Student Outcome 3.0

Project participants will increase in positive attitude toward school by 20 percent as measured by the School Sentiment Index (SSI)

Procedure:

The project director administered the SSI to the target population in November 1976 and May 1977. A comparison group of 19 randomly-selected students also completed the SSI. The SSI is a measure of student attitude toward school developed by the Instructional Objectives Exchange at the University of California in Los Angeles.

Findings:

There were no significant differences between the project and comparison group students at pretest time. The pretest mean for the treatment group was 198.88. The projected score for objective attainment at a 20 percent increase was 238.66. The posttest mean for the treatment group was 218.05 which was not sufficient for objective attainment.

The goal of a 20 percent increase in student attitude towards school was determined by the project director prior to selection

of the instrument that was used to measure student attitude toward school. For future projects, the evaluator recommends that all instruments that are to be used should be reviewed prior to setting project objectives. The 9.64 percent gain actually shown by the group was impressive and did result in raising the mean level of attitude toward school for the treatment group to nearly equal to those of the comparison group. The variance of the treatment group was very diverse, to the extent that the treatment and comparison group differed statistically significantly at the .01 level of confidence. The data supporting this statement about significant differences between groups is presented in Table 4 below:

TABLE 4: Summary of SSI Posttest Differences Between Project and Comparison Group Students

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t
Project Participants	19	218.05	26.58	3.81*
Comparison Group	24	218.28	13.57	

*P $<$ .01

Analysis of the SSI subtests show that project participants improved most in their attitude toward Mode of Instruction and Interpersonal Relationship with Students.

The data to support this statement is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Summary of Pre and Posttest SSI Data Taken on Project Participants and Comparison Group Students

Subscale	Possible Score	Project Participants Pre (N = 25) 19 Mean	Pre S.D.	Post Mean	Post S.D.	Comparison Group Pre (N = 19) 24 Mean	Pre S.D.	Post Mean	Post S.D.
1. Mode of Instruction	60	37.48	6.62	40.37	5.07	37.68	4.33	39.25	3.78
2. Authority and Control	40	23.92	5.74	26.21	3.56	23.68	4.15	26.63	2.72
3. Interpersonal Relationship with Students	48	27.48	6.75	32.26	5.12	27.42	5.04	30.29	4.24
4. Learning	44	26.56	5.59	28.89	4.08	27.95	4.33	28.75	2.39
5. Social Structure and Climate	60	34.80	8.11	38.47	5.93	38.63	3.48	40.0	4.05
6. Peer	32	22.24	4.57	22.53	3.0	22.84	2.57	23.0	2.25
7. General	44	26.40	6.06	29.84	4.25	30.68	5.08	30.38	3.47
8. Total SSI	328	198.88	38.14	218.05	26.38	209.89	22.20	218.29	13.57

Activity	Implementation Yes	Implementation No	Documentation	Comments
1.0 Conduct student mainstreaming				
1.0.1 Identify students for mainstreaming	X		Project records	
1.0.2 Monitor student progress	X		a. student notebooks b. evaluators' observation	Student notebooks are in project office, maintained by project director.
1.0.3 Conduct evaluation activities	X		a. teacher interviews b. evaluator observations c. project records d. teacher records	Project records are in project office. Teacher records are in their classrooms.
2.0 Inservice classroom teachers				
2.0.1 Pretest teachers	X		a. teacher mainstreaming skills and strategies survey results	seven target staff and eight regular teachers were surveyed to give comparative analysis. Results are in project office.
2.0.2 Identify appropriate inservice	X		a. staff development chart 1. attendance 2. agenda 3. ratings	Project director identified and conducted 22 hours of inservice. Additional inservice is scheduled. Staff development record is in project office. The project director maintains an inservice record which documents date, time, topic, leader of the inservice session, participants, and an evaluation record. A copy of this record is presented in Appendix B.
2.0.3 Schedule and conduct 15 hours of inservice	X			
2.0.4 Conduct classroom	X		Observation check list evaluators' record review	Comments check list in project office.

Activity	Implementation Yes	No	Documentation	Comments
2.0.5 Provide resource service			a. consultation service chart b. teacher interviews c. monthly teacher survey	Teacher survey responses were 95% very good-excellent on consultation services. Interviews indicated extensive use of consultation service. Records are at project office.
2.0.6 Administer staff interim test		X		Insufficient time from pretest to interim to determine change in skills and strategies for mainstreaming.
2.0.7 Schedule and conduct 10 hours inservice	X		inservice evaluations	Evaluator interviews indicated inservices to be helpful.
2.0.8 Repeat 2.0.4, 2.0.5	X	X	. observation check list . evaluator record preview . consultation service chart . teacher interviews . monthly teacher survey	Instruments for documentation are in project office.
2.0.9 Posttest staff	X	X	Teacher mainstreaming skills and strategies survey results.	Seven target staff and 10 regular teachers were surveyed to give comparative analysis. Results are in project office.
3.0 Achievement generated by 2.0		X		This activity was deleted because it is not interpretable.
4.0 Compile data and materials generated by 2.0 and assemble into:				
4.0.1 Teachers handbook	X	X	evaluator observation	Nearing Completion.
4.0.2 Inservice materials kit and handbook	X	X	evaluator observation	Nearing Completion.
4.0.3 Slide tape overview	X	X	evaluator observation	Overview is in project office.
4.0.4 Evaluation		X		Submitted herewith.

Evaluators Comments:

The evaluators spent six workdays observing project operations and interviewing project and school staff. The general impressions and findings of the evaluators during those visits were:

1) The project staff gained noticeably in their ability to articulate their class programs and the individual learning needs of students.
2) The project staff became much more able to diagnose learner needs, prescribe instruction, and monitor progress as the year passed.
3) The project staff began the program supporting the concept of mainstreaming and ended the year enthusiastically endorsing the project to the extent that they were excited about the possibility of assisting to expand the project to other schools within the district.
4) The inservice sessions produced varied reactions. The staff uniformly appreciated the opportunity to discuss learner needs, strategies that were successful, and procedures to offer support to their colleagues. All the inservice sessions were described as informative, helpful, and provided ideas for classroom application. Some inservice sessions were regarded as lengthy, theoretical or redundant to information they had gained during previous inservice sessions.

5) The teaching staff supported the use of a resource teacher in the role performed in this project. They stated that the resource teacher role demonstrated in the model would be worth examining for other special education teachers to expand their effectiveness.

For future mainstreaming projects it would be worthwhile to consider:

1) Pupil re/placement practices to assure a stable population. (The number of participants in Project TEAM decreased from 28 to 19 during the year.)
2) Instrumentation should be selected on the basis of known attributes and early advise of an evaluator.
3) Administrative communications should be clearly defined to avoid confusion over line and staff functions and administrative responsibilities.
4) Since staff who are able to work with special education students in a regular classroom context appear to be significantly different from their colleagues who may find the experience too taxing and frustrating, some screening procedure for staff selection is advisable.

Summary/Conclusions/Recommendations

Project teacher encouragement to activate mainstreaming (TEAM) was implemented to provide inservice training and resource teacher support to regular classroom teachers who were attempting to include special education students in their regular classroom program. The project also examined student gains of the special education students comparing their progress in regular classes with their previous progress while in special education classes. The findings of the study show that inservice training and resource teacher support assist teachers to effectively individualize instruction. Comments by the participating teachers and observations of the evaluation and resource teachers suggest that mainstreaming the special education students would be difficult to achieve without specialized and inservice resource teacher support.

There was found to be a significant difference in attitude toward the mainstreaming concept among participating teachers contrasted to their colleagues who teach regular classes. Project teacher attitude toward mainstreaming improved with time as the project progressed. Student attains achievement, and attitude toward school improved as a result of project participation. The student-related findings were of secondary importance in the study since the study was targeted at teacher behavior by providing a sufficient research base to conclude that special education students properly screened and placed and given proper support could function very well in regular classes.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the project be continued and that agencies interested in pursuing similar practices contact members of the project staff to gain first-hand accounts of the factors which contribute to providing personalized instruction to all students including those classified as special education students.

Bibliography

A complete extractable bibliography is in the teacher strategy handbook which will be forwarded under separate cover.

Appendix A

TEACHER MAINSTREAMING SKILLS AND STRATEGIES SURVEY

PROJECT TEAM

Date _____

This survey is intended to obtain feedback regarding instructional practices which may influence the success of student mainstreaming from Special Education classes to the "regular" program.

Please respond to each item by checking the one category which best estimates your practices.

To what extent do you ...

	Not at all very little 0%-25%	Sporadically 26%-50%	Considerably 51%-75%	Extensively 75%-100%
1. Provide learner objectives which specify vocabulary skills and/or other aspects of your curriculum area.				
2. Coordinate learning materials to learning objectives.				
3. Monitor the learning progress of all students.				
4. Identify entry level skills, knowledge, or other behavior of students.				
5. Prespecify specific learning objectives for each learner.				
6. Utilize specific instructional materials which are intended to facilitate learner attainment of the assigned objectives.				
7. Utilize specific instructional methods/strategies which are intended to facilitate learner attainment of the assigned objectives. This includes grouping patterns, use of tutors (peer, cross-age, volunteers, paid, etc.), off-campus studies, etc.				

	Not at all very little 0%-25%	Sporadically 26%-50%	Considerably 51%-75%	Extensively 75%-100%
8. Assess learner mastery of assigned objectives before assigning new objectives.				
9. Provide feedback to learners' parents regarding learner progress.				
10. Provide feedback to learners regarding their progress.				
11. Recognize, commend, praise, or otherwise reward learners for their accomplishments.				
12. Display a positive attitude toward, or regard for, all learners.				
13. Include students in selecting learner objectives which they the learner must attain.				
14. Utilize information provided by resource specialists to plan programs for learners.				
15. Collaborate with other teachers with whom you also teach the same students you are attempting to provide with successful mainstreaming experiences, to plan learner objectives and activities.				

Appendix B

Project TEAM

Teacher Survey

Teacher _____
(name or code No.)

Please respond to the following statements by indicating the extent to which you agree/disagree with each one. Indicate your choice by checking which response category best describes your feeling about each statement. This information is required as part of the evaluation of a funded program at La Habra High School to mainstream special education students. Your cooperation and assistance is appreciated. Thank you.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Mainstreaming will promote absenteeism among special education students who are put back into regular classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Mainstreaming should be made available in only a few selected classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The social needs of special education students are better met in self-contained classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Special education students have learning difficulties which require instructing by teachers with training in teaching exceptional children.	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Special education students have behavior problems which require instructing by teachers with training in teaching exceptional children.	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. It would be detrimental to the learning environment of "regular" students to mainstream special education students into them.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. Meeting the unique needs of special education students who are mainstreaming the regular program requires more time than is available to regular classroom teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Mainstreaming is an excellent practice which should be advanced.	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I am willing to mainstream special education students into classes I teach.	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The learning needs of special education students are better met in self-contained classrooms.	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. In order to mainstream effectively, it is necessary to have an array of objectives specified in advance to assist in individualized instruction.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. To mainstream special education students it is necessary to have many more teaching materials than would normally be required.	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Teachers have an obligation to assist special education students who are being mainstreamed to be successful in their classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Working with special education students in a mainstreaming program facilitates teacher understanding of individual student differences.	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Special education students who participate in a mainstreaming program have better self-concept than those who do not participate.	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Special education students are as honest as regular class students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Special education students are as happy as regular class students.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. Most special education students are as emphathetic with others as are regular class students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Special education students are less able to select areas of interest for learning than are regular class students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Most special education students are as cooperative as are regular class students.	☐	☐	☐	☐

In what classes offered at La Habra High School do you believe that mainstreaming would be most successful?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Scoring Key

for

Project TEAM

Teacher Survey

Item Number	Score Value
1	1-4
2	1-4
3	1-4
4	1-4
5	1-4
6	1-4
7	1-4
8	4-1
9	4-1
10	1-4
11	4-1
12	1-4
13	4-1
14	4-1
16	4-1
17	4-1
18	4-1
19	1-4
20	4-1

Appendix C

FULLERTON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

SPECIAL EDUCATION - PROJECT TEAM

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1976-77

DAY - TIME						INSERVICE SCHEDULE	LEADER	Participants				EVALUATION: Number Attendees				EVALUATION: Rating Scale				
MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT			Principal-Resource Pers.	Teachers	Classified Staff	Other	Principal-Resource Pers.	Teachers	Classified Staff	Other	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Excellent
AUGUST 2																				
12:00 - 3:00						OVERVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATION	Dr. Tom Kampwirth, CSULB	X	X			2	5							X
AUGUST 16																				
12:00 - 3:00						NEUROLOGICAL CAUSES OF LEARNING DISABILITIES	a) Dr. Lloyd Carnahan FUHSD	X	X			1	5						X	
						STUDENT DATA	b) Project Director	X	X			1	5						X	
AUGUST 19																				
			9:00 - 12:00			RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR MAINSTREAMING	Dr. Elaine Haglund, CSULB Lee Stevens, CSULB	X	X			2	6							X
SEPTEMBER 2																				
			7:00 - 10:00			THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS OF EXCEPTIONAL PUPILS	Judy Comito, FUHSD	X	X	X		2	3	1						X
DECEMBER 8																				
		8:00 - 3:00				BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT	Virginia Kelly, CSUF Terry Mosher, CSUF	X	X	X		3	7	1					X	

Appendix C

FULLERTON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

SPECIAL EDUCATION - PROJECT TEAM

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1976-77

DATE - TIME						INSERVICE SCHEDULE	LEADER	Participants				EVALUATION								
												Number Attendees				Rating Scale				
MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT			Principal-Resource Pers.	Teachers	Classified	Other	Principal-Resource Pers.	Teachers	Classified	Other	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Excellent
JANUARY 15																				
					9:30 - 1:00	BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP - II	Virginia Kelly, CSUF Terry Mosher, CSUF Judy Conito, FUHSD	X				2	5						3.48	
FEBRUARY 4																				
				3:00 - 6:00		TEACHER EFFORTS EVALUATION	Elizabeth Trotter Project Director, L.H.H.S.	X				1	7							4.7
FEBRUARY 14																				
5:30 - 8:30						TEACHER EFFORTS EVALUATION	Elizabeth Trotter Project Director, L.H.H.S.	X			X	1	7		1					4.5
FEBRUARY 28																				
5:00 - 8:30						CONTRACTING IN THE MAINSTREAM	Vince Senik, L.H.H.S.		X			1	5 + 1							4.6
JUNE 6																				
5:00 - 8:00						TEACHER EFFORTS EVALUATION	Elizabeth Trotter Project Director, L.H.H.S.	X	X											